



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/682,314	08/17/2001	James Kenneth Aragonés	RD-28217	2332

41838 7590 06/19/2006

GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY (PCPI)
C/O FLETCHER YODER
P. O. BOX 692289
HOUSTON, TX 77269-2289

EXAMINER

CRAIG, DWIN M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2123

DATE MAILED: 06/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/682,314

Applicant(s)

ARAGONES ET AL.

Examiner

Dwin M. Craig

Art Unit

2123

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 15 May 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-93.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).
13. ☐ Other: _____.

Paul P. Rodriguez 6/4/06
Principal Examiner
Art Unit 2125 2123

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Examiner reviewed Applicants' arguments and has found them to be persuasive in that the current rejection does not clearly map the limitations of Applicants' current claim language to the cited references. The Examiner maintains that building a baseline model using a service history database, as disclosed by the combination of Weinstock US Patent 6,223,143 and Aragonés US Patent 6,067,486, is obvious.

As regards the rejection of claim 1, Weinstock discloses a system for performing baseline modeling (Figure 16 item reference S1102 and Col. 24 lines 26-39 and note line 37 "Then, when analysis runs are made the Baseline Model is used to SUM UP the lowest level scenarios to produce the desired results.") and a baseline modeling component that builds an engine baseline model for an ideal engine from preprocessed data, wherein the engine baseline model relates engine performance variables as a function of engine operating conditions (It is noted by the Examiner that Applicants' have defined what ideal data is involved in creating the ideal engine in Applicants' specification in paragraph [0002], it is noted that the ideal model involves data collected such as Altitude, temperature, power setting and airspeed, in other words, a collection of data, Weinstock teaches a collection of data used to create a baseline, (Figure 24 reference 62 and Col. 24 lines 40-41 and note line 40, "A Baseline will be constructed for whatever level is highlighted in the hierarchy [reference 62]."). Further, the hierarchy disclosed in Figure 24 of Weinstock consists of Engine Data, for example, Nozzle Failure, Interstage Seal, Housing structure failure, which is a collection of data and data that relates engine performance as a function of operating conditions, therefore the functional equivalent of an engine baseline model for an ideal engine from pre-processed data is disclosed in Weinstock. The only deficiency of Weinstock is the lack of an engine service database that contains engine data. Argones US Patent 6,067,486 discloses an engine service database that contains engine data.

The Examiner respectfully asserts that this combination is proper for the motivation given in the last Office Action.